

## REMARKS

### Summary of Office Action

Claims 1-100 are pending in this application.

Claims 1-5, 7-18, 20, 23-30, 32-43, 45, 48-55, 57-68, 70, 73-80, 82-93, 95 and 98-100 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious from Shoff et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,240,555 ("Shoff") in view of Swix et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,718,551 ("Swix"). Claims 6, 31, 56 and 81 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious from Shoff and Swix in view of Bruner U.S. Patent No. 5,594,661 ("Bruner"). Claims 19, 44, 69 and 94 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious from Shoff and Swix in view of Kambayashi U.S. Patent No. 6,157,809 ("Kambayashi"). Claims 21, 46, 71 and 96 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious from Shoff and Swix in view of Reimer U.S. Patent No. 5,696,905 ("Reimer"). Claims 22 and 47 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious from Shoff, Swix and Reimer in view of Portuesi U.S. Patent No. 5,987,509 ("Portuesi"). Claims 72 and 97 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious from Shoff and Swix in view of Portuesi.

### Summary of Telephonic Interview

Applicants would like to thank the Examiner for the courtesies extended during the February 24, 2009 telephonic interview with the undersigned. During the interview, the Examiner's rejections with respect to the independent claims were discussed. Applicants explained the differences between the claimed invention and the prior art (discussed below). The Examiner acknowledged that the differences appeared to overcome the prior art of record.

### Applicants' Reply

Claims 1-5, 7-18, 20, 23-30, 32-43, 45, 48-55, 57-68, 70, 73-80, 82-93, 95 and 98-100 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious from Shoff in view of Swix. Claims 6, 19, 21, 22, 31, 44, 46, 47, 56, 69, 71, 72, 81, 94, 96 and 97 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious from Shoff and Swix in view of various combinations of Bruner, Kambayashi, Reimer, Portuesi. Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

Applicants' invention, as defined by amended independent claims 1, 26, 51 and 76, is directed to systems, a method, and processor readable medium for providing on-demand media with supplemental content in an interactive television application. The systems, method, and processor readable medium include, *inter alia*, a user equipment device that receives a request for on-demand media from a user and transmits the request to a remote server. The remote server receives the request and identifies supplemental content that is related to the on-demand media in response to the request. The remote server retrieves the identified supplemental content and provides the on-demand media and the supplemental content to the user equipment device in response to the request.

Shoff discusses an interactive entertainment system. A viewer computing unit determines whether a program on a channel is interactive and contains supplemental content by checking for the presence of a target specification in the EPG data field 58 (Shoff, col. 8, line 62 to col. 9, line 8). The viewer computing unit then retrieves the supplemental content based on the target specification from headend 22 (Shoff, col. 9, lines 20-25).

The Examiner alleges that in Shoff the supplemental content is retrieved in response to the request for on-demand media because the video stream and supplemental content are transmitted together (Office Action, page 4). Applicants respectfully disagree.

As discussed during the interview and acknowledged by the Examiner, applicants respectfully submit that Shoff does not show or suggest retrieving supplemental content that is related to the on-demand media in response to the request for on-demand media, as required by applicants' claims 1, 26, 51 and 76. Instead, Shoff requires that the supplemental content be specifically requested either by the user or the system at the user device and is thus not retrieved in response to a request for on-demand media. Indeed, in one embodiment, Shoff states that the video stream and supplemental content can be transmitted together, however, in this embodiment the viewer computing unit (not a remote server) must automatically activate the target resource and thereby transmit a specific request for the supplemental content (Shoff, col. 9, lines 60-65 and col. 10, lines 15-20). Therefore, in Shoff, even when the supplemental content is transmitted with the video stream, a request for the supplemental content is still required for its retrieval which is different from retrieving the supplemental content in response to the request for on-demand media received at the remote server, as defined by applicants' claims 1, 26, 51 and 76.

Moreover, during the interview the Examiner alleged that Shoff retrieves supplemental content in response to a request for on-demand media in discussing that an Internet browser is launched when the viewer tunes to a channel (Shoff, col. 3, lines 14-25). However, as discussed and acknowledged by

the Examiner during the interview, a separate request for the supplemental content that is displayed in the Internet browser is nevertheless required (e.g., by retrieving the web address stored locally in the EPG) which is again different from applicants' claims which retrieve the supplemental content in response to the request for on-demand media (Shoff, FIG. 3; col. 3, lines 1-10; and col. 9, lines 60-65).

Finally, Shoff states "[a]s long as the viewer does not activate the icon, the viewer computing unit continues to receive the video ... without any supplemental content" which is clearly different from retrieving and providing supplemental content with the on-demand media to the user device in response to the request for the on-demand media, as required by applicants' claims (Shoff, col. 9, lines 49-55). In particular, whereas Shoff requires the user or the device to specifically request the supplemental content for retrieval from the remote server, applicants' claims retrieve the supplemental content in response to receiving a request for on-demand media at the remote server.

None of the secondary references or Swix, cited by the Examiner as allegedly showing other limitations of applicants' claims, makes up for the deficiencies of Shoff relative to the rejection.

Accordingly, for at least these reasons, applicants respectfully submit that claims 1, 26, 51, and 76 and claims 2-25, 27-50, 52-75, and 77-100 which depend, directly or indirectly from claim 1, 26, 51, or 76 are patentable.

Conclusion

For at least the reasons set forth above, applicants respectfully submit that this application is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and prompt allowance of this application are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,  
/Gall C. Gotfried/

---

Gall C. Gotfried  
Registration No. 58,333  
Agent for Applicants  
ROPES & GRAY LLP  
Customer No. 75563